

In the Claims:

1-14. (Canceled)

15. (Withdrawn): A method for unit channelization in a liquid crystal display system, said method comprising:

- providing a plurality of individual liquid crystal display units, each of said units able to display data;
- arranging said units in a tiled-configuration;
- substantially encasing said units in a structural support system, said structural support system having a transparent cover to facilitate viewing of said units;
- grouping said units to form at least one channel, said channel having a processor and a power source to control the operation and data display of said units, each of said units able to simultaneously display different data; and
- redirecting data between units to provide data redundancy.

16. (Withdrawn): The method for unit channelization of claim 15, further comprising the step of simultaneously displaying substantially the same data on two units.

17. (Withdrawn): The method for unit channelization of claim 15, wherein said redirecting step further comprises redirecting data from a faulty unit to an operational unit.

18. (Withdrawn): The method for unit channelization of claim 17, further comprising the step of displaying said redirected data on said operational unit.

19. (Withdrawn): The method for unit channelization of claim 15, wherein said arranging step comprises forming a top display section and a bottom display section.

20. (Withdrawn): The method for unit channelization of claim 19, wherein said grouping step comprises forming two channels.

21. (Withdrawn): The method for unit channelization of claim 20, wherein said providing step comprises four liquid crystal display units.

22. (Withdrawn): An aircraft instrument display panel comprising:

a plurality of LCD units in a tiled-configuration, each of said units configured to simultaneously display different data;

a supporting mechanism including a screen divider placed over said units and a carrier having an equal number of depositories as said units;

a transparent cover atop said units;

a frame structure surrounding said cover, said supporting mechanism, and said units;
and

a channelization system comprising a plurality of channels, said channels coupled to one or more of said units to form a channel group, said channel group controlling said data display of said units in said group and providing a redundant data display.

23. (Withdrawn): The aircraft instrument display panel of claim 22, further comprising a manual control feature on said frame structure, said manual control feature coupled; to said channelization system.

24. (Withdrawn): The aircraft instrument display panel of claim 22, wherein said screen divider comprises a dark color.

25. (Withdrawn): The aircraft instrument display panel of claim 22, wherein said frame structure comprises a bezel connected to a backplate.

26. (Withdrawn): The aircraft instrument display panel of claim 25, wherein said backplate comprises an equal number of slots as said units.

27. (Withdrawn): The aircraft instrument display panel of claim 25, wherein said slot providing electro/mechanical routing to said unit.

28. (Withdrawn): The aircraft instrument display panel of claim 22, wherein said redundant data display comprises redirecting data from one unit to another unit.

29. (Withdrawn): The aircraft instrument display panel of claim 22, comprising four liquid crystal units and said tiled-configuration comprises a substantially square shape.

30. (Currently Amended): A liquid crystal display system comprising:

four autonomous liquid crystal display units arranged adjacent to each other, ~~each of the liquid crystal display units includes an array of lighting elements;~~

a housing comprising a structural support system ~~and a transparent cover~~, said housing substantially surrounding said units; and

a channelization system in communication with said units, said channelization system comprising:

a first channel processor coupled to first and second data sources and to first and second liquid crystal display units; and

a second channel processor coupled to the first and second data sources and to third and fourth liquid crystal display units,

wherein each of the first and second channel processors is operable to control the data from both of the data sources to present on the respectively coupled displays.

31. (Currently Amended): The system of Claim 30, wherein said structural support system comprises a frame secured to a cavity and enclosing ~~said transparent cover and~~ said units.

32. (Original): The system of Claim 31, wherein said structural support system further comprises a carrier having said units disposed therein.

33. (Currently Amended): The system of Claim 31, wherein said structural support system further comprises a screen divider ~~between said cover and~~ said units.

34. (Original): The system of Claim 30, wherein said channel display processors display data from the same data source.

35. (Previously Amended): The system of Claim 30, wherein said arranged liquid crystal display units comprise top liquid crystal display units and bottom liquid crystal display units.

36. (Previously Amended): The system of Claim 35, wherein the top liquid crystal display units include the first and second liquid crystal display units.

37. (Previously Amended): The system of Claim 35, wherein the bottom liquid crystal display units include the first and second liquid crystal display units.

38. (Previously Amended): The system of Claim 35, wherein the top liquid crystal display units include the first liquid crystal display unit and the bottom display units includes the second liquid crystal display unit.

39. (Previously Amended): The system of Claim 35, wherein the top liquid crystal display units include the second liquid crystal display unit and the bottom display units includes the first liquid crystal display unit.

REMARKS

Claims 15-39 are pending. Claims 15-29 have been withdrawn. An Office Action mailed December 28, 2005 rejected Claims 30-39 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, and 35 USC §103(a).

Applicants hereby amend Claims 30, 31, and 33, and traverse. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

OBJECTION OF DRAWINGS UNDER 37 CFR §1.83

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a) as not showing every feature (“lighting elements”, “a housing comprising a structural support system”, and “a transparent cover”) of the invention specified in the claims. With respect to the amended Claims, Applicants hereby respectfully traverse this objection.

Applicant has deleted the limitation of “lighting elements” in the Claims. Similarly, the limitation of “a transparent cover” has been deleted. With respect to the limitation of “a housing comprising a structural support system,” Figure 3 shows a bezel 306 “similar to the previously described bezel 102” (p. 3, para. 30), which bezel “may comprise any suitable material used for light-duty structural support, e.g., lightweight metals and plastic” (p.1, para. 13). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that “a housing comprising a structural support system” is shown in Figure 3.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Office Action rejected Claims 30-39 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action states that the application does not support the claim limitation “a first channel processor coupled to **the first and second data sources**...and a second channel processor coupled to **the first and second data sources**.” Applicants hereby respectfully traverse this rejection.

As illustrated in Figure 2 of the present application, the first channel processor 202 is coupled to channel I/O 210, and the second channel processor 204 is coupled to channel I/O 212. Channel I/Os 210 and 212 each use one or more bidirectional data buses shown in Figure 2 as “Bidirectional Data Bus 1” and “Bidirectional Data Bus 2” to convey information to and from the channel I/Os, and in turn, to and from processor 202 and processor 204, respectively. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the first and second data sources are adequately illustrated in the figures as being coupled to both a first and second channel processor.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 30, 31, and 34-39 as being unpatentable over Nishida in view of Hayes et al. With respect to the amended Claims, Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Office Action states that “Nishida discloses in figs. 6-10 a liquid crystal display system comprising four autonomous liquid crystal display units...” and “Hayes discloses in fig. 2 a liquid crystal display system comprising liquid crystal display units...” Applicants respectfully disagree, and note that neither a “liquid crystal display” nor “liquid crystal display units” are mentioned, taught, or claimed in either Hayes or Nishida.

Additionally, the Office Action admits that Nishida lacks anticipation of a first channel processor coupled to **first and second data sources** and a second channel processor coupled to **the first and second data sources**. Applicants submit that Hayes et al. fails to remedy this defect. Hayes et al. does not teach that “each of the first and second channel processors is operable to control the data from both of the data sources to present on the respectively coupled displays” as claimed in amended Claim 30. Instead, the system of Hayes et al. teaches that the “left and right FMC’s 102, 104 communicate with associated left and right control display units (CDU’s) 112, 114, respectively” (col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 2). In case of failure of either CDU 112, 114, the system of Hayes et al. provides “the capability for an FMC 102, 104 to automatically detect a failed CDU and operationally implement the backup CDU 120 *to act in*

place of the failed unit” (emphasis added; col. 4, lns. 50-56). Additionally, in Figure 3 of Hayes et al., illustrating a method of using the system of Hayes et al., there is no situation in which “each of the first and second channel processors is operable to control the data from *both* the data sources to present on the respectively coupled displays” as claimed in amended Claim 30. Instead, the FMCs of Hayes et al. are operable to control the data from *only one of* the data sources to present on the respectively coupled displays. Thus, Hayes et al. does not supply the teachings missing from Nishida, and therefore Nishida in view of Hayes does not anticipate Applicants’ Claim 30 or its dependent Claims 31-39.

The Office Action rejected Claims 31-33 as unpatentable over Nishida in view of Hayes and further in view of Seraphim. Seraphim does not supply the teachings missing from Nishida and Hayes noted above. As Nishida in view of Hayes does not render Claim 30 unpatentable, and Claims 31-33 depend from Claim 30, Nishida in view of Hayes and further in view of Seraphim cannot anticipate Claims 31-33.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants’ agent listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}



James A. Born

Registration No. 46,564

Direct Dial: 206.957.2493